DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 505 EA 018 305

AUTHOR Kerchner, Charles Taylor
TITLE Labor Policy in School Districts: Its Diffusion and Impact on Work Structures.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Eugene. Center for Educational Policy and Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 78p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, Center for Educational Policy and Management, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403(4.25 prepaid or purchase order).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Board Administrator Relationship; Case Studies; Collective Bargaining; Conflict Resolution; Contracts; Elementary Secondary Education; Grievance Procedures; *Labor Relations; Principals; Questionnaires; School Based Management; *School Districts; Superintendents; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Associations; Teacher Attitudes; *Unions; *Work Attitudes; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

A study of 10 schools in 3 school districts examined how labor relations affect teachers' work attitudes and behavior, and how labor relations and contract provisions take on practical significance in the school and classroom. A three "generation" model of labor relations development--based on levels of conflict and the legitimacy accorded the union--was used. The study was conducted in three parts: (1) districtwide and school-level organizational data were obtained through interviews with the 10 principals; (2) a questionnaire was administered to 439 teachers; and (3) 80 teachers were interviewed. Of the three districts studied, one, located in a community of mixed ethnicity and socioeconomic status, had peaceful labor relations; the second, also in a mixed-race community, had highly acrimonious labor relations; the third, a suburban high school district, serving a changing population and experiencing severe enrollment declines, practiced a "cooperative mode" of collective bargaining. Seven references are provided. The appendixes contain case study questions and a list of the documents collected, the questionnaire, and the interview guide. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267505

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

LABOR POLICY IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS: ITS DIFFUSION AND IMPACT ON WORK STRUCTURES

by
Charles Taylor Kerchner
The Claremont Graduate School

February 1986

Center for Educational Policy and Management
College of Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
(503) 686-5173

EA 018 395

The preparation of this final report for FY 83 was made possible through an Institutional Grant awarded by the National Institute of Education to the Center for Educational Policy and Management. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the NIE or the U.S. Department of Education.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction: A Social Systems Approach to Understanding Labor Relations 1

Chapter 2 Conducting the Study. 4

Chapter 3 Description of Study Districts. 7

3.1: Stability in the Gateway Unified School District. 7
3.2: Political Divisiveness in Albright Unified. 11
3.3: Cooperation in Point George 14
3.4: Three Districts in Generational Perspective 16

3.4.1: Classifying The Districts According to Generation . . 21

3.5: Labor Perceptions on a Cross-Sectional Basis. 26

Chapter 4 School Site Variations on a Theme 29

4.1: The Contract As a Rubber Ruler. 30

4.1.1: Differential Meaning from Similar Contracts 32

4.2: Fractional Bargaining at the School Site. 33

4.3: The Importance of Conflict and Its Management 34

4.3.1: A Few Good Grievances 35

Chapter 5 Unionization and Teacher Work Roles 38

5.1: The Definition of Teachers' Work. 38
5.2: Twelve Questions for Teachers 45
5.3: Similarities and Differences in Perceptions of Teachers' Work 49
5.4: Conclusions about Labor Relations and Teachers' Work Roles. . 52

5.4.1: Isolation and Withdrawal. 54

References 58

Appendix A: Case Study Questions and Document Collection. 59

Appendix B: Questionnaire 61

Appendix C: Interview Guide 69

Table of Exhibits

Exhibit 1: Questionnaire Responses by School District. 6

Exhibit 2: Three Generations of Labor Relations. 17

Exhibit 3: Segmentation of Districts into Labor Generation 22

Exhibit 4: Teachers' Perception of Labor Relations Conflict Level. . . 24

Exhibit 5: Teachers' Perception of Labor Relations Legitimacy Level. . 25

Exhibit 6: Frequency Distribution of Labor Generations of Teachers by District 28

Exhibit 7: Classification of Ideal Work Types. 41

Exhibit 8: Teachers' Work-Role Responses by District 45

Acknowledgments

This work was made possible by the financial support of the Center for Educational Policy and Management of the University of Oregon and the diligent efforts of six Claremont Graduate School students who contributed substantially to the design and execution of the study.

Ultimately, of course, the study was made possible by those teachers and school administrators who allowed us to visit their schools and consented to answer our questions. In the larger sense, they are the ones conducting the research, for teacher unionization remains one of the major social experiments of our generation. They have been our teachers, and we have simply been the note takers.

In the spring of 1983, an informal seminar was held on the impacts of labor relations in schools. Seminar members were Kamiran Badrkhan, Joyce Resh, Christine Maitland, Harold Shimmin, and Pamela Wright. All participated extensively in the research design, in the acquisition of field data, and in telling their professor what it all meant. Honoruth Finn joined the group during the last stages of field work when the energies of the rest of us were beginning to flag.

Pam Wright was particularly diligent, innovative, and skillful in converting raw data into computer runs. Credit for creating the questions used to discriminate among different teacher work roles belongs to Hal Shimmin.

Each of these students will make their own independent contributions, adding to and further analyzing the data set.

My thanks to each and all.

Charles T. Kerchner

Chapter 1

Introduction: A Social Systems Approach to Understanding Labor Relations

The research reported here rests on a tradition that holds that the impacts of unions can best be explained in terms of the way bargaining, grievance handling, and other processes of labor relations are integrated into the ongoing processes of organizations. In public education, this tradition requires that one examine operations at the classroom and school levels and try to associate attitudes and behaviors of individual teachers with variations in labor policy from its formation to its impact on teachers' and principals' work structures. Thus, it is the social and organizational integration of unionization's rules, beliefs, and activities that, ultimately, gives meaning to labor relations.

Several previous studies have probed the dynamics and impacts of unionization on school governance and organizational functioning. This study investigates the relationships between teachers' functions and role perceptions and the characteristics of labor relations in their school districts. In effect, the study asks whether the effects of labor relations on teaching <u>are strong and predictable.</u>

The study also examines the means by which the "web of rules" of labor relations and its social environment are transmitted (Dunlop 1958). Because there is substantial variation in the social and political systems of schools, we find that similar labor relations events--negotiations, grievances, strikes--have quite different organizational impacts. Likewise, similar contract provisions are socialized into various schools and classrooms in very different ways. This happens because a word or phrase that has one meaning when it is written in the contract takes on a different meaning when it is used as a basis for action in a social context.

A combination of case study, questionnaire, and interview evidence from more than 400 teachers in 3 school districts suggests strong labor relations effects on teaching, even though teachers and administrators do not often recognize the effects. The effects are also varied, and although our anecdotal and statistical data identified some regularities in the effects, our technique and instrumentation did not tap all the possible sources of variation. Yet, two conclusions emerge:

* First, the impact of the school district and the school site is crucially important to the ways in which labor relations gain meaning in a school district. Relationships of faculties and individual teachers with their principal determine what faculty thinks about the importance and impact of labor relations.

* Second, the evidence about the relationship between the stage of unionization and its impact on a teacher's work is somewhat contradictory. The anecdotal record of the teachers we interviewed suggests that teachers tend to perceive an increase in the degree to which their work is rationalized and preplanned for them in relation to the stage of unionization or the length of time unionism has existed at the school. However, our measurements of these perceived changes did not reveal the uniform differences we expected to find among school districts.

The variation by school site is important because the transmittal of labor relations policy is haphazard. For example, we studied one school

district, which had a distinctive labor relations philosophy, where teachers and site administrators came to learn the meaning of labor relations by interpreting their situations rather than by adhering to explicit training in contract administration. As a result, the substance of labor relations in this school district varied substantially from school site to school site. Contracts were interpreted at the school site rather than at the district level, teachers at the various schools engaged in forms of local or fractional bargaining with their principals, and the "real rules" or expected behaviors varied by school site. These variations were so substantial that it is not unreasonable to suggest that school sites, not districts, are the best units of analysis for conducting labor relations research.

The differences in labor belief are important because of the existence of different phases or stages of unionization--in the terminology used here, the labor "generation" to which the district belongs. The concept of "generations" is built around differences in conflict about labor relations and the legitimacy accorded the union. As might be expected, conflict and the management of conflict appear to dominate teacher and administrator perceptions of unionization. Conflict is almost universally seen as bad, divisive, and threatening; and one of the strong school-site norms is that "quiet is good." During conflict periods, interaction and group activities diminish in number and substance, and the definition of the teacher's work role embraces isolation and independence. Similarly, the legitimacy and efficacy with which the teachers union and the administration are perceived determine the extent to which teachers see their jobs as being part of the organization or independent of it.

Chapter 2

Conducting the Study

The study was conducted in three parts. In the first part, we collected district-level organizational data by using a modified version of Levinson's Organizational Diagnosis (1972) as a guide. In the second part we distributed to teachers a questionnaire that helped us determine their attitudes toward labor relations and their perceptions of their work. In the third part, we conducted interviews with teachers. The data collection guidelines, the questionnaire, and the interview guidelines are included in this report as Appendixes A, B, and C, respectively.

As in any field study, the first task was finding school districts willing to participate in the study. The choice of districts was deliberately nonrandom. Given small sample size in terms of districts, it was more important to choose locations where labor relations could be expected to be active (but not abnormally so) than it was to have an unbiased representation. Each of the three districts chosen had a reputation for having a somewhat distinctive labor relations history; at the least, this would provide interesting case studies. Each of the three districts and their teacher organizations we contacted agreed to participate, and for the purposes of this report we named the districts Albright, Gateway City, and Point George. (All names of school district personnel mentioned in this report are also pseudonyms.) The field research took place primarily between January and May, 1983, with some teacher interviews extending into June.

We began our research by conducting preliminary interviews with the district superintendent, the primary teacher union executive, and the district personnel or labor relations manager in each of the three districts. (Subsequently, we interviewed additional central office staff members and

asked them specific questions about staffing, enrollment, curriculum, and so forth.) During the interviews, we used a modified Organizational Diagnosis outline as a guide. Our primary intent was to piece together the labor relations saga of the district, that is, its story in historical terms and in terms of the emotions that surrounded it. Accounts from different people in the same district generally agreed in terms of the history, events, and causation--an indication of the candor with which we were treated--but the accounts diverged in regard to the norms and values involved in those events.

Our selection of the schools in the study was based on the recommendations made by the district superintendent and the teacher union executive in each of the three districts. During the interviews, we asked them to identify the most representative or "typical" school--elementary, intermediate, and secondary--in their respective districts. (The Point George District was a high school district; thus, we studied three high schools from this district.) To the nine schools recommended by the district superintendents and teacher union executives, we added another site, a continuation school, from the Point George District. Therefore, we studied a total of ten schools in three districts.

After completing the site selection process, we arranged interviews with the principal in each school. Our interviews were designed to trace the flow of rules and policies involving labor relations from their origin in the central office, through the training the principal received, to the school site. The interviews, lasting from 50 to 90 minutes, were remarkable for their diversity and for the quite different sets of implications and impacts that principals perceived, even among those principals who worked in the same district and under the same labor contract.

The principals arranged for us to administer the questionnaire at faculty meetings. The questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix B. Nearly all

staff members completed the questionnaires. A small number of teachers was absent from each school (one elementary school operated year-round and had roughly one-quarter of its staff on vacation), and about ten teachers in one high school declined to participate. Data on the number of respondents to the questionnaire are provided in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1

Questionnaire Responses by School District

	Elementary	Intermediate	High School	Total
Gateway City	31	50	74	155
Albright	17	26	49	92
Point George	*	*	192	192
Total	48	76	315	439

* Point George was a high school district.

During each presentation and questionnaire administration we asked teachers to volunteer for interviews. Some 80 teachers volunteered, or about 18 percent of those who completed questionnaires. About 20 teachers were interviewed at school sites, and the other 60 were interviewed over the telephone. The interview guide is reproduced in Appendix C.

Chapter 3

Description of Study Districts

3.1: Stability in the Gateway Unified School District

Gateway City, the major source of students for the Gateway Unified School District, is a growing, multiethnic municipality. The population grew 24 percent between 1970 and 1980, with Hispanics and Asians constituting most of the population increase. The area is not impoverished, but incomes vary widely from the estimated $19,000 mean for family income.

Gateway Unified is a K-12 district of about 20,000 students. About 90 percent of these students are from minority groups. The teachers are experienced, 450 of them having taught for 16 or more years. Student achievement on the California Assessment Program is at the high end of the state's expectancy band for both third and sixth grades.

There are twenty-seven schools in the district: four high schools, one of which is a continuation school; six intermediate schools serving grades five through eight; and seventeen elementary schools for students in kindergarten through fourth grade. All twenty-seven principals report directly to the superintendent. As the following field note suggests, this rather unusual hierarchy can be interpreted as giving principals substantial operational autonomy:

> The principals have rejected arrangements to have a chain of command other than direct to the superintendent. Specific problems, such as questions about supplies, curriculum, or other routine matters, are taken care of with the assistant superintendents involved, but real problems are taken care of with the superintendent. The principals like the possibility of lobbying the superintendent directly for what they need. This sometimes takes the form of direct pleas, but not very often.

The district's school board membership has been fairly stable. One board member began service in 1983, while the terms of service of the other

four range from four to eighteen years.

Gateway Teachers Union has a long and stable history dating back to 1939, but that, of course, was long before collective bargaining was being practiced. By the mid-1960s the Union's membership had grown to more than 1,000. It was during this period of growth that Salvadore Ruiz was hired as executive director. He was "a local boy"--both a former student and a former teacher in the district. Ruiz has remained as executive director ever since, outlasting three superintendents. The organization he heads is stable and orderly. Salaries and benefits tend to be among the highest in the county.

However, this was not always the case. Before the Rodda Act (California's public school collective-bargaining law) was passed in 1975, the meet-and-confer relationship with the district was filled with conflict as the union expanded and consolidated its organization. Conflict during this period was partly by design. The union, for example, traditionally designated a strong and articulate female teacher to negotiate for it, a strategy aimed at aggravating male administrators. The union became a serious problem for the superintendent, who eventually lost the support of the community, the principals, and the board. According to one source, the union "helped the board not to think too much of him."

The next superintendent developed a more openly hostile relationship with the union. It was during his tenure, just before the Rodda Act, that the most serious confrontation between the district and the teachers took place. During contract negotiations the union began to bait the superintendent with the threat of a strike. Union representatives appeared to be making preparations by setting up a strike fund and holding meetings with the teachers.

In response, the superintendent overreacted by going to the board meeting with an elaborate strike plan that included procedures to be used at

all schools. Approximately 1,000 teachers attended the same board meeting and insisted that they had no intention of striking. Further, the teachers protested, they did not understand what all the turmoil was about. The result of this trickery was a foolish-looking superintendent who was invited to leave shortly thereafter.

The current superintendent handled management's side of the first negotiations under the Rodda Act. He recounts that at the time of the first negotiations, the union president approached him and suggested a "mutual problem-solving approach." The union wanted the community to see that collective bargaining was not creating a problem, and to this end they wanted a quick and smooth settlement. The district was also eager to end the hostile relationship it had with the union. Thus both sides were motivated to drop their lengthy opening proposals. In return for salary increases and binding arbitration, the union agreed to adopt all current board policy into the contract.

Since 1976, several contracts have been adopted, each without serious confrontation between the district and the union. Ruiz appears to be a major factor in this successful relationship. In addition to having roots in the community and skill in interpersonal relations, he has a sister who has been on the school board for the last 12 years. While no one we talked to suggested that any special favors were asked or granted because of the family relationship, everyone recognized the existence of the relationship and its influence on the tone of labor relations. Ruiz also serves on the school board of a neighboring district where he lives. The superintendent expressed his trust for Ruiz's honesty and for his practice of making "reasonable proposals."

Another factor in the district's peaceful labor relations has been the district's unwritten policy of maintaining teacher salaries above the

75th percentile for all teachers in the county. Furthermore, until the current year, administrators' salaries have been indexed to teachers' salaries, thereby eliminating a potential source of competition.

Union influence in the district has largely grown through a vigorous maintenance of its relationship with the board. The union has been active in school board elections for about a decade, though usually in a low-key manner; for example, they hold coffees for candidates and carry out some telephone duties. As Ruiz noted, "The teachers tend to think that they should not be involved in politics, and so we have to get them to do things that don't look political." Prior to the passage of Proposition 13 (California's property tax limitation initiative) in 1978, the union worked in conjunction with the district to pass tax overrides by handling activities that district personnel could not handle because they would appear to be bankrolling an election to increase taxes, an unacceptable practice for a public agency.

Contract administration has been handled in a very loose manner, and this has resulted in considerable variation in school policies. Yet this variation has never led to a formal grievance being filed. Grievances are few, and none has been filed in the last two years. Instead, most problems involving teachers are handled directly with the teacher and the teacher's principal, and the union leader. According to the superintendent, there is a clear district rule that is almost universally followed: "Don't be too hard with the contract until you check with [the superintendent]."

Finally, teacher evaluation in Gateway City is lax. Statutorially required evaluations are generally not harsh, and site administrators believe that there is a <u>de facto</u> policy in the district that teachers cannot be fired, a belief that was reinforced by the board's refusal to support a principal who sought the dismissal of a teacher several years ago.

Up until the present time, the district has not been faced with tough choices on budgetary issues involving groups of employees or types of services. However, these kinds of choices are exactly what the future holds. As we conducted our field research, the district was facing a 12 percent budget cut, and there were clear tensions between younger and older teachers about whose interests were to be served.

3.2: Political Divisiveness in Albright Unified

The Albright School District enrolls approximately 20,000 students from a community of 93,000. There are 22 elementary schools, 6 junior highs, and 4 high schools. About 75 percent of the student body comes from ethnic and racial minority families.

Prior to 1947, when the teachers' organization became a chartered local of the National Education Association, the union was, in effect, a club. The organization was not perceived as a separate body apart from the district until 1960. Its first full-time executive director was hired in 1970, and the current executive director has served in this capacity since 1972. The school district had agreements with the teachers even prior to the passage of the Winton Act (the state's meet-and-confer statute) in 1965, but the agreements were of limited substance and of doubtful enforceability. There was a one-day strike in 1976 during negotiations on the first contract bargained after the Rodda Act was passed; the apparent strike issue was class size.

There has been a series of superintendents since 1971, and during this period there has been a gradual replacement of local administrators with administrators who gained their training and experience outside the district and the region. The first superintendent during this transition was beset with the problem of divided loyalties among his administrative staff. When

he left, his replacement served as acting superintendent for a year. He, in turn, was replaced by a superintendent hired with the expectation that he would be able to "clean house" administratively, something that the previous superintendent was unable to do and that the acting superintendent did not desire to do while he was courting all factions as he sought the job on a permanent basis. This superintendent faced extremely chaotic relationships among board members and was thought to lack the elemental "toughness" necessary to unite the board or to tame the permanent bureaucracy. He was replaced by the current superintendent, who did "clean house" administratively. In the local version of the "Saturday night massacre," several administrators were moved or demoted. The teachers' organization believed that punitive transfers of teachers had also occurred, a claim the district vigorously denied. The current superintendent appears to be firmly in control of the administrative structure, but the unstable and conflictual relationship with the board remains. The union is not a benign partner in that relationship.

Much of the district's recent labor relations history must be understood in relation to the district administration's extremely contentious relationship with the school board. The contentious nature of this relationship was far more visible and conflictual than the administration's relationship with the teachers. Relations between the board and school district administrators changed about 1970, when the local superintendents were replaced by superintendents from outside the area. Candidates with political aspirations for higher office began running for the school board. Although these candidates appeared to have come from the same pool of individuals who had previously run for the board--that is, from a group who had previously been active as "school boosters"--they now seemed to be running for the school board for a specific purpose rather than as "good

citizens." According to some descriptions, the board worked throughout this period without any real coalition. Each board member acted individually, with coalitions forming around particular issues but not around support for the superintendent.

The union has been active politically since the 1960s, and it now is capable of providing full school-board election campaign support, including contributions and people to work precincts, answer phones, and provide the core of a campaign organization. However, it would be erroneous to suggest that the teachers are in control of the board any more than the administration is. The criticism and skepticism that arose in the relationships between the board and successive superintendents did, however, provide for increased communication between the union and the board. It also, partly by default, gave the union's executive director substantial influence because he was the only long-term participant in the school district's labor relations process. At the present time there seems to be a desire for labor peace. It was reported that board-of-education members told the current superintendent that they wanted peace, and as a result the teachers have made gains that teachers in other districts haven't. The contract has moved the teachers from "dead bottom" on the salary rankings to the upper 10 percent among school districts in the county. The board of education's desire for peace has also strengthened the relationship between the union's executive director and school administrators, greatly increasing the teachers' ability to engage in fractional bargaining. Now, principals usually resolve problems with the union directly rather than going to the central administration.

The teachers have been active in policy determination for quite some time. There are standard procedures for curriculum development that were in place prior to the passage of the Rodda Act; there are curriculum development

councils, elected by teachers, at each school; and there is a district committee on which the teachers hold the preponderance of membership. The net effect is that the teachers are primarily responsible for curriculum development. The board, it is said, expects the teachers to provide input and direction for curriculum matters.

3.3: Cooperation in Point George

Point George is a high school district that serves several municipalities. The residents of these communities have substantial variations in income, but generally the municipalities can be characterized as "first ring" suburbs around a central city. The district, like Albright, has undergone substantial ethnic change in its population over the last two decades. As a high school district, it has also been beset with severely declining enrollment. Two schools have been closed, teachers have been laid off and transferred, and programs reduced.

The district prides itself on a "cooperative mode" of collective bargaining, a phrase coined by the current union president, Henry Martindale. However, the roots of this relationship extend back more than 15 years, and the present system operates in a participative management focus with which the current superintendent is identified.

Until 15 years ago the district was run by a patriarch, Dr. Smith, who, it was reported, kept a clean desk and "always looked at your shoes to see if they were shined." He was replaced by a man who was considered a distinguished educator but who was not particularly well liked. The meet-and-confer relationship between the teachers and administrators began to deteriorate, and the superintendent charged a group of second-level administrators, corporately called the "directors," to "do whatever was necessary to set it right." Acting upon the recommendation of these

directors, the district adopted what it called "a large number of new communications channels." This change was based on the principle that "people should have the opportunity to participate in the decisions that affect them." Continuing discussions with the teachers' organization was one of those channels, and extraordinary use was made of task groups, study teams, and committees. These groups did not have power in the sense that the administration and the school board relinquished any decision-making rights; instead, these bodies were used to reach a consensus. It was from this history that the tradition of teachers and administrators discussing salary and working conditions grew.

The district now operates under the state's collective bargaining statute. The Point George Teachers Union is a recognized bargaining unit, but the distinctive tone and structure of relationships differ substantially from that found in other districts. This organization is nominally affiliated with the California Teachers Association (CTA) and the National Education Association, but it has little operating connection. The superintendent has only seen the local CTA representative once. According to the superintendent, "These people [our union representatives] believe that there isn't a thing that the CTA can do that they can't do better."

District negotiations proceed according to four rules:

1. The superintendent is the negotiator for the district.
2. The school board sits in on all negotiating sessions.
3. There are no outsiders.
4. Task forces and other means of communication are used extensively.

One example of the kind of procedures used in the district is in the area of teacher evaluation. The teachers have produced their own "model" system, without the direction of the superintendent, which will be used to give the district the right to suspend teachers without pay.

A fifth rule might be added to the rules above: The contract is kept very slim. The relationship between the district and the teachers is defined almost entirely by the working interactions rather than by the contract. The district does have a grievance procedure, but it is seldom used. Only two grievances have gone to the board. (The district has advisory arbitration, but it has never been used.) But in addition to the grievance mechanism, there is a "problem-processing procedure," which is largely parallel to the grievance procedure. This method can be used to address any problem without reference to the contract; and it is, in fact, used quite frequently.

3.4: Three Districts in Generational Perspective

The idea of "generations" in labor relations introduced in earlier research (Kerchner and Mitchell 1981) is important in explaining the apparent differences among districts, and, as we shall see, among the work role perceptions of teachers. We believe that teacher unionism has evoked three distinct ideas and that unionization, as the attempt to embody those ideas, can be categorized historically and organizationally in three "generations": 1) the meet-and-confer generation, 2) the good-faith bargaining generation, and 3) the negotiated policy generation. The last of these generations is in its beginning stages. The various levels and types of actions occurring in each generation are given in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2
Three Generations of Labor Relations

	The Generations		
	Meet-and-Confer	Good-Faith Bargaining	Negotiated Policy
Political Action	Organize teachers	Manage conflict	Define education
Organizational Action	Represent aspirations Define interests	Represent interests Define values	Represent judgments Define commitments
Individual Action	Generate identity	Define work roles	Express work orientation

Between these generations there are two intergenerational periods of intense social, ideological, and political conflict. At issue during the conflict periods are fundamental questions about the concept of the union, what its central purpose is, and how it ought to behave in the realms of school politics, the organization, and individuals' work lives.

The first generation represents the marriage of Progressive era reforms, which legitimated bureaucracy based on technical expertise, and human relations management, which recognized the need for employees to participate in decisions that affected their work lives. It can best be described as the meet-and-confer era, in which teachers began to organize and meet with school managers but did not consider themselves to be bargaining. The difference between meeting and bargaining is, of course, partly a function of legal definition, but in the most fundamental sense the difference was in the underlying assumptions. Some states, such as California, had statutes that gave a legal definition to the words "meet and confer," but here we are concerned with the common, generic description of

behaviors. The practice of meeting and conferring was widespread and was not dependent on statutes. It was believed that meeting and conferring emphasized the solution of mutual problems while, in contrast, bargaining implied an emphasis on self-interest.

Generally, districts pass out of the first generation prior to or with the adoption of collective bargaining. A few, however, retain its practices and beliefs well after having entered nominally into the collective bargaining era.

During the first generation meet-and-confer era there is a widespread belief that the "profession" of education is unitary. School administrators are to be distinguished from teachers by virtue of the fact that their duties are different, but their interests are seen as fundamentally the same. Both teachers and administrators are supposed to express a selfless and universal interest in "what's good for kids," and open displays of self-interest are socially illegitimate. Protecting the interests and welfare of teachers is the duty of the institution -- particularly of the administrators, who are supposed to function as the teachers' advocates, and the school board members, who, as trustees of the common good, are expected to see that teachers are provided for.

These relationships are, of course, ideological beliefs and not universal behaviors of organizations. Teachers in the first generation have self-interests, and some of them express and act upon those interests. Some administrators openly part company with teachers and repudiate the duty of administrators to represent the teachers' best interests. Even more frequently, school board members respond disinterestedly, falling prey to personal or class bias. But the idea of common interest is powerful and serves to legitimate the authority of administrators and to couch governance and organizational decision making in terms of a unitary, shared framework of belief.

Because meet-and-confer relationships are based on the premise that all educators and the public share a common interest in the schools, teacher organizations are seen as legitimate only so long as they recognize the ultimate authority of the administration and do not challenge it publicly. Teachers can legitimately form their own organizations; they can participate in a broad range of discussions and bring to bear their special knowledge; but they must interpret their special interests in terms of the whole district.

These teacher organizations sometimes have substantial influence, but more often they do not. The inclusive characteristic of these groups is signaled by the use of descriptive words such as "club" or "family" as part of their organizational title, and it is always clear that the family is ultimately ruled by administrative decisions.

In due time, social and political conditions change, bringing an end to the idea that teachers' interests can be incorporated into school policy through first generation meet-and-confer procedures. Conflict erupts--often quite suddenly--and the era gives way to a new system of labor relations.

The second generation of labor relations is symbolized by the phrase "good-faith bargaining." During this period it becomes legitimate for teachers to represent their own interests and welfare; thus, collective bargaining becomes an acceptable means of settling both economic and procedural due-process questions. Collective bargaining contracts replace administratively determined civil service salary schedules, and grievance adjudication replaces board policy or administrative discretion as the basis for settling disagreements over negotiated work rules.

Second generation norms include a very strong belief that conflict is endemic to the work place and that effective conflict management is a vitally

important aspect of the labor relations process. Strikes and other forms of public conflict occur, but they are generally viewed as a breakdown of the system, a flaw that reminds everyone of potential dangers and that reveals bad faith or lack of expertise on the part of either labor leaders or managers. Participants in second-generation labor relations value expertise and eschew amateurs, meddlers, and other outsiders who want to use labor relations for reasons other than its intended purposes of representing the interests and welfare of teachers.

One important common belief during this second generation is that labor relations has nothing to do with educational practices or school policy. This belief is apparently necessary for the stability of labor relations during this period, for it disappears during the transition to the third generation. However, close examination of school systems reveals that this belief is fundamentally wrong--changes in labor relations do in fact transform both school policy and educational practices. In attempting to limit the impact of labor relations on policy and practice, labor laws enacted during this second generation almost universally forbid bargaining over educational or managerial policy; and even though there is great tension over the proper scope of bargaining, both labor and management tend to describe the tension in terms of economic disputes or disagreements about working conditions, both of which are usually bargainable under law. Negotiations over seniority and transfer provisions become discussions of accrued property rights, and discussions of student discipline or teacher evaluation are seen as resolutions of safety conditions of employment or procedural due process. The participants will often heatedly deny that there are educational policy implications involved, and frequently they engage in collective bargaining or other labor relations processes without acknowledging that the flow of educational services is affected in any way.

When changes in policy due to labor relations do occur, they are viewed as "accidental" by-products.

The third generation, an "era of negotiated policy," has recently emerged in some school districts. During this generation the negotiating parties explicitly acknowledge that negotiations involve the way in which schools are run, the patterns of authority that exist, and the social interactions in the workplace. Managers and school boards come to see that they can utilize collective bargaining as a means to formulate personnel and organizational policies, and they come to embrace the process for just that purpose.

3.4.1: Classifying the Districts According to Generation

The standards for classifying districts according to generation evolved from a study by Kerchner and Mitchell (1981). Their work provided the idea of applying the concept of generational development to labor relations.

In order to categorize the three districts we studied into their proper labor relations generations, we used teachers' responses to two key questions, 8 and A.18, included in the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Question 8, based on a five-point response scale, had to do with levels of conflict over labor relations in the district, while Question A.18, based on a seven-point response scale, solicited the teachers' perceptions of the legitimacy with which the school board perceived the right of teachers to bargain collectively. We used calculations of teachers' responses to these two questions to classify the three districts (at .85 reliability) into their respective labor relations generation, as shown in Exhibit 3.

High levels of conflict were associated with the intergenerational periods and the early second generation, while low levels of conflict were

Exhibit 3

Segmentation of Districts into Labor Generation

		Labor Conflict Level	
	Conflict Code	Low	High
		3-4-5	1-2
Acceptance of Union as Legitimate	Legitimacy Code		
	High 5-6-7	Gateway Late Second Generation	Second Inter-generational Conflict
	Medium 4	First Generation	Albright Early Second Generation
	Low 1-2-3	Point George	First Inter-generational Conflict

associated with the late second generation and the first generation. High levels of teacher union legitimacy were associated with the late second generation and the second intergenerational conflict period, medium levels with the early second generation, and low levels with the first generation and the first intergenerational conflict period.

Substantial variation in legitimacy and conflict levels existed in the three districts we studied (see Exhibits 4 and 5). Albright teachers perceived their labor relations as being relatively conflictual--somewhere between "armed truce" and "some trust" on the five-point scale. They also depicted relatively low levels of perceived legitimacy, a mean of 3.8, which, when rounded off, would place the district within the province of the early second generation. Point George's teachers also perceived low levels of conflict, lower than Albright's, but their perception of teacher union legitimacy was substantially lower, placing the district in the first generation category. Gateway City teachers registered the lowest level of conflict (in the "peaceful coexistence" range) and markedly higher legitimacy ratings. The district is properly categorized within the late second generation.

Point George's generational assignment requires additional comment. We do not know whether Point George is a conventional first generation meet-and-confer district (in that it will move through a generational crisis and into the second generation) or whether its "cooperative mode" of labor relations will effectively remove it from the process in which one generation decays and is replaced by the next. Ultimately, the question of direction is still open. Teacher interviews revealed substantially mixed feelings about

Exhibit 4

Teachers' Perception of Labor Relations Conflict Level

District	Albright	Pt. George	Gateway	All Districts	
Open Warfare (1)	20 22.7	15 8.3	0 0	35 8.3	Number Percent
Armed Truce (2)	40 45.5	42 23.2	12 7.8	94 22	
Some Trust (3)	14 15.9	64 35.4	29 25.3	107 25.9	
Peaceful (4) Coexistence	9 10.2	42 25.2	56 36.4	107 25.3	
Active (5) Cooperation	5 5.7	18 9.9	47 30.5	70 16.5	
Number of Respondents*	88	181	144	413	
Mean	2.30	3.03	3.90	3.20	
Mode	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	

* The number of respondents does not equal that given in Exhibit 1 because not all teachers answered the question related to conflict level.

Exhibit 5

Teachers' Perception of Labor Relations Legitimacy Level

District		Albright	Pt. George	Gateway	All Districts	
Disagree	(1)	11 12.2	30 16.4	1 .70	42 9.9	Number Percent
	(2)	11 12.2	46 25.1	4 2.6	61 14.4	
	(3)	9 10	37 20.2	11 7.3	57 13.4	
	(4)	29 32.2	45 24.6	30 19.9	104 24.5	
	(5)	19 21.1	13 7.1	35 23.1	67 15.8	
	(6)	6 6.7	10 5.5	47 31.1	63 14.9	
Agree	(7)	5 5.6	2 1.1	23 15.2	30 7.1	
Number of Respondents*		90	183	151	424	
Mean		3.80	3.02	5.17	4.12	
SD		1.63	1.45	1.39	1.79	

* The number of respondents does not equal that given in Exhibit 1 because not all teachers answered the questions related to legitimacy level.

how independent and aggressive the union should be. The distribution of individual teachers by labor generation (Exhibit 6) shows that more than 40 percent of the Point George teachers displayed first generation perceptions. But two other groups, each including approximately 25 percent of the teachers, had quite different perceptions. The first of these two groups placed the Point George district at the stage of first intergenerational conflict. The second group asserted that its union was already strong and legitimate and that the union's task was to solve problems and manage conflict, which indicates that the district is at a late second generation stage. There is no way to determine from the data which one of these views is correct.

3.5: Labor Perceptions on a Cross-Sectional Basis

The dynamics of movement from one labor relations generation to the next depend on variance in teacher belief and action. For any given school district at any given time there are both "leaders" and "laggers." The leaders are radicals in the literal sense; they break with the dominant belief of the labor generation and adopt the perceptions of the next generation or intergenerational period. During the first intergenerational conflict period, union organizers are the most conspicuous of these leaders; but leaders are also present at every other phase. Although the point is not directly relevant to this study, we found that school board members were the active leaders or radicals during the second intergenerational conflict period because they took control of the direction of labor relations. Laggers are also easily identified by their adherence to the beliefs and values of a previous generation, even though the district evidences different patterns of behavior. Teachers with first generation beliefs about unions are particularly conspicuous in the second generation. To them, unionization

was a mistake; things were better before. Those who might be termed the "old guard radicals" are also visible among the teachers during the early second generation because they continue to display attitudes toward conflict and contention that are typical of those displayed during the intergenerational conflict just past. They, in effect, are still fighting a battle that has been won.

The marked disparity in generational belief among the teachers in these three districts can be seen in Exhibit 6. In this exhibit each teacher's perception of conflict and legitimacy is cross-tabulated using questions 8 and A18 in the same way that the district means on those two questions were used in the calculations for Exhibits 3-5. Gateway City is highly homogeneous, with two-thirds of its teachers displaying late second generation labor relations perceptions, a categorization congruent with both the statistical placement of the district and its labor history. Point George displays somewhat less congruence. Over 40 percent of its teachers indicated that they held first generation beliefs, which is congruent with its statistical and historical placement. But nearly a quarter of the teachers placed their district in a first intergenerational conflict period and another quarter placed it in the late second generation. In Albright, by contrast, there is a great dispersion of belief. Teachers placed the Albright district in the early second generation (the district's classification based on statistical and historical data) only slightly more frequently than they placed it in any other stage. The dispersion shown in the Albright and Point George districts is typical in situations of labor relations restiveness and is a signal that significant numbers of teachers are either leading the district toward another generation or are lagging behind in the last one.

Exhibit 6

Frequency Distribution of Labor Generations of Teachers by District

	Gateway City		Albright		Point George	
First Generation	38	25.3%	16	18.4%	76	42.0%
First Intergen. Conflict	5	3.3%	19	21.4%	44	24.3%
Early Second Generation	3	2.0%	23	26.4%	8	4.0%
Late Second Generation	101	67.3%	12	13.8%	48	26.5%
Second Intergen. Conflict	3	2.0%	17	19.5%	5	2.5%
Number of Respondents*	150		87		181	

* The number of respondents does not equal that given in Exhibit 1 because not all teachers answered all questions.

In summary, we see three quite different school districts each operating in communities with diverse cultures and family economies. Gateway City is conspicuous for its stability, Albright for the prominence of its school board politics, and Point George for its attempts at consensus making and cooperative labor relations. In terms of labor relations generations, Gateway City's union legitimation and low conflict signal that it is a late second generation (good-faith bargaining) district. Albright is classified as an early second generation district. Point George is a first generation meet-and-confer district. These distinctive characteristics and generational classifications set the stage for the primary results of the study--the relationships between labor relations and teachers' work roles.

Chapter 4

School Site Variations on a Theme

Teachers unions are largely organized by school district, but school sites so substantially shape the impacts of unionization that it is not incorrect to suggest that individual schools, as well as school districts, have labor relations. The teachers' real "contract" is the work rules they actually obey and the norms they adopt to control their own behavior. Just as schools have individual organizational climates, they also have individual labor relations cultures. Thus, in a real sense, there was a different contract at each of our ten school sites. The contract was often formed at each school site, for there was a substantial amount of bargaining between principals and their teachers. In several specific instances, the rules of teacher behavior were changed in reaction to teacher actions.

Schools develop unique labor relations cultures precisely because the teacher's work is so isolated. The school principal is frequently the only organizational superior a teacher sees in the space of a work week. In a setting where work is characterized by physical and communicative isolation, the principal becomes the personification of the school organization. When teachers talked about labor relations they talked first about their principal. When principals talked about labor relations, they talked first about how it applied in their school. And, interestingly, both teachers and principals almost always told us that their school was unusual. "You'll find things here a little different," was the common claim, and, as it turned out, an accurate one.

However, the use of statistical analysis to measure differences among individual schools is of little help to us. One-way analysis-of-variance procedures showed a strong and significant overall difference among school

sites on the same variables that differentiated the school districts. But partly because the number of school sites was greater than the metric for the variables, few pairs of sites were significantly different in the statistical sense. On the other hand, the interviews with teachers and principals proved very revealing, as we shall see, in that they revealed a number of important differences not measured by statistical analyses.

4.1: The Contract as a Rubber Ruler

Labor contracts may implement the rule of law but they do not replace the rule of humans. Almost everyone in the schools we studied found advantage in not enforcing labor contracts to the letter. Selective rule enforcement allowed principals to maintain control, to reward teachers who were thought of as generally helpful and hard working, and to punish those who were not. Labor leaders also found that what they called "flexible enforcement" allowed them to engage in microlevel problem solving for the teachers they represented. One union leader spoke of "enlightened flexibility" toward the contract and spoke of turning back teachers who brought trivial complaints about faculty meetings running 15 minutes too long. As he put it, "What we want is a signal that the whole body of the contract is accepted. If it is accepted, we [unions] are accepted, too."

Principals also rely on flexibility in carrying out the contract. On some occasions, they use contract stipulations to enforce unpopular actions. For example, one principal described his use of the contract as a basis for mandatory teacher attendance at PTA meetings:

> It's been very important here to have teachers attend PTA meetings, which is something that they don't particularly want to do. But the parents at this school work so very hard in supporting the school, that the least that we can do is to appear at the monthly board meetings. I put in each of the Stull evaluations an objective of attending the monthly board meetings. Attendance is required in the contract, but the previous principal didn't enforce it.
>
> If the contract had not required attendance, I would have tried to work it out so that there was at least representation from the staff--people attending every three months, or something like that.

At other times, however, principals admit that they rely on a case-by-case approach. It is the school environment and the principal's role perception that shape the real work rules. As a principal at one of the schools we studied described it:

> Every principal interprets the contract differently. We have ongoing meetings about how to interpret it. I remember that after the current contract was signed we had an all-day session with [a union representative] where we went through it page by page and item by item about what each item was supposed to mean. But I'm pretty flexible with it myself, probably more than [the union representative] would like. Some of my colleagues are very rigid, but I like being able to handle each situation separately.
>
> [One administrator] feels that you should interpret the contract to the letter, but the superintendent has never come out and said so explicitly, and we take his silence on the matter as meaning we have some flexibility.

Recently, for example, this principal let two teachers go home 30 minutes before the expiration of the board day because they both had to come back to school that night for a meeting and each had family commitments they needed to handle. He also occasionally calls meetings that go beyond the time specified in the contract. Sometimes people leave those meetings early, but only if they have other commitments that they have discussed with him beforehand. No one simply walks out.

4.1.1: Differential Meaning from Similar Contracts

Similar contract clauses come to have different meaning for different schools and individuals. One of the universal work rules stipulated in the contract is a specification of what constitutes a work day. Each of the three districts has the length of the work day specified, but in each school it is interpreted and enforced differently. One principal actively monitors the arrival of teachers by strolling through the teachers' parking lot at the contractually designated starting hour. However, the usual approach is one of latitude, with intervention only "if somebody's late all the time" or "if they're so late they miss their classes." The work hours are enforced by a zone-of-tolerance technique in which unspecified deviations are allowed, but, as one administrator put it, "if someone violates the rule too often, then I would counsel them about it." But there is also differential tolerance in working hours according to who is involved, and both principals and teachers defend its legitimacy. One principal said:

> I know [which teachers are] here at 7:00 a.m. working their buns off, staying after school, leading the activities and all the rest. I also know who never does anything. If the workers want to go home early or show up late once in a while, that's fine with me. The others don't even bother to ask.

In the same fashion, teachers carried around a vision of an adequate work day that often deviated from the official work day. In one district, the teachers linguistically differentiated between the official work schedule, "the board day," and their own work day. A field note shows a teacher's comparison of official and real time:

> The official school day is between 8:15 and 2:45. "I always get here by 7:00 and I almost always leave early. I do so with an absolutely clear conscience." No one had ever spoken to him about leaving early.

All the teachers we talked to knew the official rules about when to come to work and when to go home. But they also differentiated between the "official day" and the day that they were actually expected to work. Answers to a question about exceptions to the official day varied markedly by school site. At some sites, teachers expected to be allowed to leave early, "if I had a good reason" or "if I could find someone to cover my class." But at other sites, teachers said they would not expect to be released except in an emergency, and then their pay would be docked. Nearly universally, though, the teachers felt that they, not their principals, enforced the rules about arriving and leaving work. The most common response was "we're on our honor."

We also asked teachers about their attitude toward teaching larger-sized classes than the contract required, working during breaks or lunch periods, and agreeing to other exceptions to the official rules. In each case, the teachers responded with varying degrees of flexibility; the most common response was "if there's a good reason." From the principal's perspective it was clear that when a teacher responded to a request to work late, attend an extra meeting, or teach a larger class than required, the principal had taken on an unspecified obligation to respond in kind at some future occasion.

4.2: Fractional Bargaining at the School Site

Not only is there variation in the rules by school site, but groups also actively engage in quasi-bargaining to set the rules. The idea of work-group bargaining is not unknown to the literature on labor relations,

but it has not received heavy emphasis either; and school districts routinely deny and ignore the existence of bargaining at the school-site level. Principals are taught that relations with the teachers union are a matter for central office consideration. "Fractional bargaining" was the term that James Kuhn (1961) gave to the process in which work groups use the grievance process to change their "real" work rules. By grieving or threatening to grieve, workers gained management's attention. The specific subject of the grievance was often irrelevant to the workers' actual complaint, but the grievance process provided a means to alter management's agenda. We found fractional bargaining through the grievance mechanism at some of our school sites, and use of other mechanisms to carry out fractional bargaining was virtually a universal practice at the schools we studied. Teachers are able to engage in these quasi-bargaining practices largely because it is universally expected that principals want to keep a quiet campus.

4.3: The Importance of Conflict and Its Management

Teachers and administrators alike told us that unionization led to conflict between teachers and administrators; "an adversarial relationship" was the commonly used phrase, but the phrase was used in circumstances that led one to believe that more than teacher unionization was involved. The "adversarial relationship" phrase was heard in all three districts, including those where relationships seemed quite pacific. Teachers almost always used the phrase in the context of commenting about a particular principal and that principal's relationship to the faculty rather than in the context of describing an incident or disturbance arising because of labor relations. Moreover, for teachers the functional meaning of the "adversarial relations" message was that conflict was uncomfortable for them and that they wished to avoid it.

For the site administrators we interviewed, one of the clear central meanings of labor relations administration was that "a good school is a quiet one." The less attention that labor relations attracted to their school the better. As one principal put it:

> The superintendent would much rather that we solve problems at the site. He doesn't want to be told that we have problems. I tend to react to teachers the same way; I think that we all do. If a teacher works for months without you hearing about problems, you tend to think that he or she is doing a pretty good job.

Another principal commented that "the folks in the White Tower are perfectly happy if they don't hear anything from 'over the hill.'"

4.3.1: A Few Good Grievances

It is not surprising in these circumstances that the grievance mechanism is seldom used. Several of the principals we interviewed had never had a written grievance filed and few had more than one or two. The more usual pattern was to engage in what principals call "problem solving." Often problem solving occurs during individual meetings with teachers or, in some of the schools, during regular faculty meetings. Regardless of where it occurs, the implication is that there is "wiggle room" for both sides during these meetings.

One principal remarked that teachers often harm themselves by grieving and gave an example from his school:

> The teacher has to make sure that he or she wants the result. There was a situation in which a teacher grieved a class size maximum, and the result was that in order to respect the contract all the classes in the school had to be rescheduled. The teacher ended up teaching classes that he didn't want just in order to get the class size that he was entitled to.

But the more usual meaning of grievance was a threat to the principal. As a principal in one district described it:

> School climate is very important in the district. The superintendent has "Support Your Staff" plastered all over everything. Principals who do not maintain a good relationship with their staffs are criticized.

At one site a group of senior teachers active in the union succeeded in getting a negative evaluation of a young bilingual education teacher retracted--as they described it, it was "torn up on the spot."

Once in a while, though, a grievance can serve a site administrator's purposes as a signal to the central office. At one school there had been several grievances recently over heating and air conditioning problems at the school; the problems apparently had been chronic. The school's principal explained:

> It seems to me that the teachers are under the impression that this route works. The administration holds that these working conditions are not grievable, but a grievance seems to get action from the central office faster than my filing a maintenance and repair order.

Occasionally, principals would also discretely encourage the union to file a grievance about class size violation. "We get them an additional teacher," noted a union leader.

The principals didn't perceive what they were doing as labor relations. Principals said they had not been extensively trained in contract administration, and they saw no particular need. What they knew about labor policy in the district they largely learned through socialization. In one principal's language, "contract administration is not a matter of constantly referring to the contract. It's in the drawer unless there is an incident." Moreover, principals often consider contract administration to be routine and less disruptive than other incidents. One principal's remarks sum up the point:

> There was no inservice on this contract despite the fact that there have been changes in the evaluation clause. But the fact of the matter is that there is so much chaos in the district through the school board, lawsuits, administrative transfers, and other action, that labor relations is not highly visible.

The comments cited above from teachers and administrators interviewed in our study make it clear that both parties perceive the labor contract as a document that provides some flexibility for solving problems at the individual school. On the whole, we can say that labor contracts in the districts we visited were being rewritten or at least reinterpreted at the school site.

Chapter 5

Unionization and Teacher Work Roles

Prompted by earlier work that posited a relationship between teacher work roles and the institutional legitimacy of teacher unionism, we used data gathered from questionnaires and interviews to determine the relationship between labor relations generation and teachers' perceptions of their work roles. Ultimately, the data we collected were more illuminating about the shared or common view of teaching that teachers in all three districts held than it was about the differences in viewpoints among the teachers. Responses that appeared to be related to labor relations revealed that as teachers move through the labor relations generations they increasingly believe that their work is more frequently preplanned for them and they display a greater acceptance of procedures for setting and enforcing standards. These characteristics are generally representative of the teaching mode we have come to call "craft." That teachers saw their work as more preplanned is generally consistent with the findings of Kerchner and Mitchell (1981), but the teachers in the three districts we studied did not display an increased tolerance for direct observation. To the contrary, they appeared to be vigorously independent.

5.1: The Definition of Teachers' Work

The scheme for identifying teachers' work roles envisages four ideal work types--labor, craft, art, and profession. Those four types are defined by two dimensions. First, every job has some system of "task definition" that specifies the particular activities workers are expected to perform. Second, all jobs have some sort of "oversight mechanism" for monitoring the performance of these tasks. By distinguishing among various "ideal type" alternatives for defining tasks and overseeing worker performance, we can

develop a framework for comparing teaching with other types of work. (The following material in Section 5.1 relies heavily on Chapter 6 of Kerchner and Mitchell [1981]. For a revised version of the same report, see Mitchell and Kerchner [1983].)

Task Definition. There are two basic approaches to task definition. Some tasks are structured primarily through "rationalization," that is, specific tasks are preplanned by either managers or the workers themselves and then undertaken as a matter of routine enactment of "standard operating procedures." In other job settings, however, tasks are primarily "adaptive"--they require extensive accommodation to unexpected or unpredictable elements embodied in a preplanned program. In adaptive situations, emphasis must be placed on the worker's ability to respond to conditions arising on the job, to exercise proper judgment regarding what is needed, and to maintain intellectual and technical flexibility in the performance of needed tasks.

Oversight Mechanism. Monitoring or overseeing workers in the performance of their tasks is also typically structured in one of two basic ways. Some workers are subjected to direct oversight either through close supervision or through stringent reporting requirements. Employers monitor workers to assess how well they perform required tasks. In other jobs oversight is indirect. Workers' preparation and skill--that is, their ability to perform the work--are the prime considerations. In the first case, the work itself is inspected. In the second, the work frequently goes unexamined, and the workers are licensed or certified to perform the work on their own.

The criteria used to evaluate these two different dimensions of work are quite different. Licensed workers are expected to have at their disposal a set of learned techniques for performing needed tasks, and they are held

accountable for the care and precision with which they apply these specialized techniques. When work is inspected rather than licensed, however, a worker's cooperativeness, dedication, and overall level of effort are seen as the prime considerations. If special skills or techniques are required, managers are expected to guide workers by directly supervising and critically reviewing the required procedures.

As indicated in Exhibit 7, four distinctive work structures are created when the basic task definition systems and oversight mechanisms are combined. "Labor" is the term which best describes those work settings in which tasks are planned rationally and oversight involves the direct supervision and monitoring of workers. As used here, the word "labor" has a special meaning. All jobs involve labor to the extent that they all require an expenditure of effort directed at task accomplishment. However, we are not using "labor" in this sense. The word "labor" is also frequently used as a term of denigration--some jobs are labelled as "merely labor." While this usage captures the important sense that labor jobs have limited technologies, it deflects attention away from the important structural and organizational differences between labor and other types of work. Laboring is not defined by its association with "low-level" jobs. It is rather the rationalized and preplanned character of the tasks involved and the direct inspection of how those tasks are performed that uniquely distinguishes labor from other ways of structuring work. While low-level jobs are more frequently subjected to close scrutiny and supervision, there is no intrinsic reason why high-status jobs cannot also be so structured. For example, William H. Whyte's The Organization Man (1956) paints a picture where the carefully planned and closely supervised work we are calling "labor" is performed by people who hold executive job titles but are confronted with a social ethic which "rationalizes the organization's demands for fealty and gives those who offer

it wholeheartedly a sense of dedication in doing so " (p.6).

Loyalty and insubordination are the most important concepts in evaluating labor work. It is very important for laborers to give allegiance to the organization for which they work and to respond energetically and promptly to directions given by superiors. This need for loyalty arises because laborers are not expected to take personal responsibility for the overall purposes toward which their efforts are being directed. As Frederick Taylor's Principles of Scientific Management (1911) makes abundantly clear, it is the manager, not the laborer, who must decide when, how, and for what purposes work effort should be directed. The worst offense of a laborer is insubordination to a supervisor, not inadequate results. Laborers need to do what they are told to do, when they are told to do it. If the result is unproductive, it is the manager's, not the worker's, fault.

Exhibit 7

Classification of Ideal Work Types

Task Definition	Inspection of Work: Direct inspection of work in process or work product	Inspection of Work: Indirect inspection through license or other examination before a practitioner is allowed to begin work
Preplanned	LABOR	CRAFT
Adaptive	ART	PROFESSION

Craft workers differ from labor workers in that they are generally free from direct supervision but are held responsible for selecting and applying appropriate specialized techniques to their work. They are expected

to know how and when to apply these techniques in order to realize the goals or objectives of the work. In place of direct supervision, craft workers are licensed, certified, or otherwise explicitly identified as having special abilities. Managers (or clients, in the case of craft workers who operate on a direct contract basis) establish the overall objective of the work; but once the craft specialist takes an assignment, he or she is expected to carry it out without needing detailed instructions or close supervision. Licensure has become public policy in many craft areas because incompetent or unscrupulous craft workers are difficult for unskilled clients to recognize. Thus the watchful eye of the state is often substituted for the caveat emptor of the marketplace when technical competence is crucial to adequate task performance.

Precision and competence are the basic criteria used in the evaluation of craft work. The care and precision with which craft tasks are performed are of utmost importance. Craft workers are even expected to know when or how to perform particular tasks without direction from supervisors and are deemed incompetent if they are unable to recognize which techniques to use in the performance of particular tasks.

The rationalization and planning of tasks are important in both labor and craft work structures, but they take very different forms. For labor work, rationalization is conventional and refers to standardization of procedures or specificity of managerial directions. For craft work, however, rationalization is technical and refers to the expertise of the workers or the appropriateness of the methods being used. For laborers, standard operating procedures are right because they are standardized. For craft workers, by contrast, they are standardized because the craft accepts them as technically correct.

Professional workers, like craft workers, are expected to possess a

set of specialized techniques. Where professional work differs from craftwork, however, is in the way tasks are recognized and defined. While both craft and professional workers are expected to have the competence to perform specialized tasks, professionals are expected to analyze or diagnose situational factors and adapt their work strategies to the true needs (not just the expressed wishes) of their clients. A craft worker has to know whether a particular task can be performed and how to perform it. But a professional is responsible for deciding whether the task should be performed. As a craft worker, a surgeon should know how to perform an operation; as a professional he or she should know whether or not the patient actually needs it.

Responsibility and malpractice are the key elements in evaluating professional work. Professionals are expected to be competent craft workers and to apply their competence responsibly. Professional responsibility involves considering the implications of choosing a particular course of action, resisting interference and pressure from superiors or outsiders, and accepting personal responsibility for the outcomes. Thus, while the worst criticism to be leveled at a craft worker is incompetence, malpractice is the appropriate label for inadequate professional work. Malpractice differs from incompetence in two important ways. First, even if the execution of a task is completely competent, a professional worker is guilty of malpractice if it can be shown that the task was unnecessary or inappropriate to a particular case. Second, in cases of malpractice, the judgments of peers within the profession, rather than of supervisors or other superiors, are recognized as most important in determining whether the work was properly executed.

Work that involves art is characterized by both adaptive task definitions and direct monitoring of workers' activities. Although artistic work may require a high level of technical skill, the social organization of

this type of work is not based on the particular skills to be utilized in its execution. Artists are recognized in the products they produce and by the quality of their engagement in the work itself. While competence in applying specific techniques may be important, it is not the ultimate concern in the execution of an art. Artists are expected to rise above the limits of established conventions when necessary and to develop novel, unconventional, or unexpected techniques. Like professional workers, artists are expected to be flexible and adaptive in defining their work responsibilities. Like laborers, however, artists are monitored and evaluated directly; their work is assessed on the basis of whether it is engaging, exciting, and creative.

The key concepts the evaluation of artistic work are its sensitivity or frivolity. Whereas the professional is required to be responsible, the craft worker to be competent, and the laborer to be loyal, the artist in an organizational setting is called upon to be sensitive to the need for integrity, creativity, and spontaneity. Artists are frequently granted a great deal of autonomy in order to allow them to exercise this artistic sensitivity. There is no such thing as malpractice in art; but if the artist is frivolous and refuses to enter fully into the creative process, then he or she has failed. Loyalty to preplanned institutional programs, a basic requirement in laboring work settings, is often the enemy of great art.

The works of solitary artists (like novelists or painters) are evaluated through inspection and critical assessment by individual consumers or by editors, juries, and reviews in journals and newspapers. Organized artistic ventures, such as the design of a building or the performance of a play, are closer in form to teaching. Here, the creation of an artistic masterpiece depends heavily on adequate coordination or direction as well as sensitive review and critical evaluation.

5.2: Twelve Questions for Teachers

In order to categorize the work perceptions of teachers in our study districts, we used the second part of the questionnaire to ask them 12 questions about their perception of work roles. Forced-choice answers discriminated between conceptually opposite perceptions of teachers' work. We used an eight-point scale, where each question was related to one of the dimensions of the four-cell, ideal-type description displayed in Exhibit 7. These questions, along with the statistical results related to the teachers' responses, are reproduced in Exhibit 8.

In addition to being asked to respond to the 12 questions, each teacher was asked a series of questions (Kerchner and Mitchell 1981) about the teacher organization, the administration, and the school board (see questions A.1-A.19 in Appendix B). Finally, each respondent was asked some standard questions about age, experience, gender, and similar demographic variables. These questions are also included in Appendix B.

Exhibit 8

Teachers' Work-Role Responses by District

Question		Eight-Point Scale	
B1	My work is largely autonomous. [craft/profession]	1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8	My work is largely directed by others. [art/labor]
	F-Ratio 2.686, p = .06		

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	92	2.9457	1.9179
Gateway	155	3.5419	2.0169
Pt. George	190	3.3579	1.937

Exhibit 8, continued

Teachers' Work-Role Responses by District

B2 There are lots of standard practices here. [labor/craft]

Each one of us works in different situations. [art/profession]

F-Ratio 2.589, p = .0763

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	92	4.9239	2.0661
Gateway	155	4.7190	2.0048
Pt. George	187	4.3850	1.9180

B3 My teaching is mainly being responsive to situations. [art/profession]

My teaching is mainly being carefully planned. [labor/craft]

F-Ratio 8.087, p = .0004

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	91	5.0879	2.1636
Gateway	154	5.0519	2.0317
Pt. George	185	4.2162	2.2786

B4 Teachers here are independent. [craft/profession]

Teachers here are part of the organization. [labor/art]

F-Ratio 14.884, p = .0001

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	91	3.3736	1.9980
Gateway	154	4.7532	1.9346
Pt. George	189	4.0423	1.9429

B5 Lack of cooperation by a teacher poses a severe threat to a high-quality program. [labor]

Teacher incompetence poses a severe threat to a high-quality program. [craft]

F-Ratio 9.043, p = .0001

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	90	4.3333	2.2486
Gateway	147	5.2381	2.0148
Pt. George	180	4.3944	1.8140

Exhibit 8, continued

Teachers' Work-Role Responses by District

B6 Sensitivity to students' individual differences is essential for good results. [art]

F-Ratio 0.905, p = .4055

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	92	3.0870	2.1208
Gateway	153	3.3137	2.0853
Pt. George	187	3.0214	1.9563

Loyalty to carefully planned programs is essential for good results. [labor]

B7 Poor achievement test results often indicate poor management. [labor]

F-Ratio 0.155, p = .8560

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	91	4.4725	1.9908
Gateway	145	4.5448	1.6115
Pt. George	176	4.5916	1.6807

Poor achievment test results often indicate too much time being spent frivolously. [art]

B8 Loyalty to my school counts most. [labor]

F-Ratio 2.516, p = .0820

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	92	6.1087	2.0025
Gateway	153	6.0392	1.9259
Pt. George	185	5.6324	2.0470

My individual sense of responsibility for good practice counts most. [profession]

B9 Dedication and effort are central to good teaching. [labor/art]

F-Ratio 0.770, p = .4638

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	92	3.5870	2.2096
Gateway	153	3.5882	2.2229
Pt. George	183	3.3279	2.0412

Care and precision are central to good teaching. [craft/profession]

Exhibit 8, continued

Teachers' Work-Role Responses by District

B10 Establishing a group feeling of togetherness is essential. [art] / Enforcing high standards of teacher competence is fundamental. [profession]

F-Ratio 4.700, p = .0096

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	92	4.4535	2.1040
Gateway	150	4.8667	2.1100
Pt. George	182	4.1538	2.1281

B11 Good teaching requires expertise and precision in applying proper techniques. [craft] / Good teaching requires flexibility and accuracy in the diagnosis of students' problems. [profession]

F-Ratio 8.632, p = .0002

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	92	5.5109	2.2113
Gateway	152	5.7961	1.8498
Pt. George	184	4.8750	2.1705

B12 A responsible teacher must resist interference in determining appropriate classroom strategies. [profession] / Even the most creative teacher must be responsive to suggestions or critical suggestions. [art]

F-Ratio 8.396, p = .0003

	Count	Mean	S.D.
Albright	91	5.5604	2.0559
Gateway	153	6.0392	1.6736
Pt. George	183	5.1694	2.0778

Note: Respondent totals do not always match those given in Exhibit 1 because not all teachers answered all questions.

5.3: Similarities and Differences in Perceptions of Teachers' Work

Teachers in our study shared a strong common perception of their teaching as an art. Several of the 12 work-role perception questions failed to discriminate significantly among groups of teachers, and those questions revealed a common belief among teachers that their work roles are associated with art. However, on some questions, univariate tests also showed that a teacher's school district was highly significant in determining differences in work-role perception, much more so than the teacher's age or sex, or the grade level the teacher taught. When taken together, these dimensions provide a picture of more rationalized, structured, organizationally intense teaching in Gateway City, a late second generation site, than in Point George, a first generation district. Albright, an early second generation district, fell in between the other two districts on almost all variables where there was a statistical difference.

Statistical comparisons are shown in Exhibit 8, which displays each district's mean and standard deviation on each question. Because the scale on each question was between 1 and 8, a mean score greater than 4.5 shows a group preference for the answer on the right end of the scale. A score of less than 4.5 indicates a preference for the choice on the left end of the scale. The statistical significance for a one-way analysis of variance is also shown; this identifies those questions that discriminated among the districts and those that did not.

An examination of Exhibit 8 shows that there are five questions on which teachers in all three districts are either well above or well below the scale's 4.5 midpoint, and on most of these items a univariate test of differences between the districts is not statistically significant. Four items--B6, B9, B11, and B12--suggest that teachers identify relatively

strongly with the art cell in the ideal-type structure. In response to question B6, teachers strongly favored sensitivity to students' individual differences over loyalty to a preplanned program. In answering B9, they associated good teaching with dedication and effort more than care and precision. In B11, they chose flexibility in diagnosis over precision in technique. (Question B11 was intended to distinguish craft from profession, but in a more general sense it can be seen as distinguishing the top two terms from the bottom two in the diagram given in Exhibit 7.)

The fifth question on which teachers from all three districts stand well apart from the 4.5 midpoint is B1, which asks teachers whether they see their work as largely autonomous or largely directed by others. Although there was a difference in responses by district, the teachers strongly felt that their work was autonomous. This response is certainly not at odds with what we know of the sociology of teaching, but it does suggest an important aspect of these teachers' self-perception that does not correspond to the ideal-type scheme. Question B1 was intended to test perceptions across the vertical axis of the scheme (Exhibit 7), which associates art and labor with direct oversight and craft and profession with more isolated workplaces and an indirect inspection of work products. The teachers perceived themselves as being sensitive, responsive, dedicated, flexible, and <u>alone.</u> The art they saw in themselves was more of the kind practiced by the individual practitioner than by the organizational team player--the art of the garret rather than of the stage. The juxtaposition of artistic self-perception combined with autonomy or isolation raises interesting organizational and labor policy questions that will be considered in a later section.

In addition to the common perceptions of teachers' work roles, there appear to be systematic differences associated with the district's labor relations generation. Responses to questions intended to measure this

association (Questions B3, B5, and B10) were statistically significant, and the difference among the districts occurs around the midpoint in the scale.

Question B3 probes the teachers' perceptions of their work as situationally responsive or carefully planned. Teachers in Gateway City and Albright indicated that their work was carefully planned (mean scores were just over 5), while teachers in Point George indicated that their work was significantly on the situationally responsive side (the mean score was 4.2). These statistical data derived from the questionnaire were reinforced by comments made during the interviews. For example, one elementary principal talked about the new expectation of using a basal reader, math, and science series and of central office personnel coming to the school sites "for the first time" to check on whether it was being used.

Question B5 asks whether high-quality programs are more threatened by a lack of cooperation (a measure of group interaction) or by teacher incompetence (a measure of acquired technique and skill). Here, Gateway City teachers perceived incompetence as the greater threat (mean 5.2), while Albright and Point George teachers saw uncooperativeness as the greater danger (means of 4.3 and 4.4, respectively). A principal in one of these latter two districts described the unwillingness of his teachers to participate in group events as an illustration of the threat of uncooperativeness. There appeared to be little direct concern about teacher incompetence, as this field note suggests:

> My impression is that faculty evaluation is not taken too seriously. An assistant principal's comment was, "We have good teachers here." I pressed a bit for specifics on how faculty was evaluated, and the answer was noncommittal.

Question B10 is in a similar vein. It weighs teacher preference for the value of establishing a feeling of togetherness against that for enforcing high standards. On this question, Gateway City teachers, taken as

a whole, were on the right-hand side of the scale (mean 4.9), and Point George teachers were on the left (mean 4.1). Responses from Albright teachers fell at the midpoint (mean 4.5) and were not significantly different from the other two.

The answers to questions B3, B5, and B10 fell across the midpoint, which represents the vertical axis of the ideal-type structure that divides the labor/art side from the craft/profession side (see Exhibit 7). The dominant difference between these two sides is the degree of emphasis placed on quality assurance through knowledge of technique. The results from our study indicate that teachers in Gateway City perceived their work as more craft-oriented than did teachers in Point George. Teacher responses in Albright fell between the two.

Question B4 measures teacher responses to labor relations conflict. Teachers in Gateway City perceived themselves as part of an organization. Teachers in Point George crossed over to the other side of the midpoint and viewed themselves as being independent. Teachers in Albright felt strongly independent, substantially removed from a perception of organizationally based work. This statistical finding is consistent with interview data, which suggests that teachers become atomistic during times of increased labor conflict. They may or may not directly join the labor conflict, but they do withdraw into "their own business" insofar as teaching is concerned.

5.4 Conclusions about Labor Relations and Teachers' Work Roles

While there are some statistically significant relationships between labor relations generations and teacher work-role definition, it is apparent that the instrumentation developed here is not yet sufficient to systematically explain the differences in teachers' work perceptions and to extract from those differences that portion which can be explained by

differences in labor relations practices.

Some of these problems are usual ones, and some are uniquely related to labor relations. The usual problems include alternative reasons for the work role differences. There are other differences among the school districts. As noted in Chapter 3, the three districts have quite different administrations and somewhat different settings. While our statistical analysis considered teacher age, level of school taught, gender, and other variables without finding significant relationships to teacher work roles, there may be other aspects of the organization's culture that the questionnaire we used did not tap.

There may also be construct validity problems. Generally speaking, if the concepts that the investigator has in mind are salient ones to the respondent, then answers to different questions aimed at differentiating the same concepts will be closely related. In our questionnaire, there are symptoms that this may not be the case. For instance, questions B2 and B3 are supposed to distinguish between labor/craft and art/profession work views. However, the teachers' responses to these two questions were contradictory. Responses to question B2 ordered school districts in one direction (at the .08 level) and responses to B3 ordered them in the other direction (at the .004 level). Questions B1 and B9 are supposed to distinguish between the labor/art and craft/profession dimensions. Responses to B1 were clustered toward the craft/profession end of the scale, and for B9 they were clustered toward the labor/art end. One concludes that the respondents are differentiating these questions on a basis other than the ideal-type work-role scheme.

The second difficulty in measuring the causal relationship between labor relations and teachers' work definitions is the virtual impossibility of constructing a causal chain of events through an organization. As we

noted in the case studies on the three school organizations, the rules of labor relations are not universally interpreted, and labor contracts and labor leaders' mindsets are not monolithically transmitted into the schools. In the three school districts we studied, there was a virtual lack of direct training or indoctrination for either teachers or administrators about what the proper response to labor relations was to be. Teachers and administrators alike discovered the proper responses as they went along.

5.4.1: Isolation and Withdrawal

There is one final aspect of our investigation into teachers' work roles and labor relations. During the interviews and in the analysis of survey responses we were led to suspect that a relationship existed between labor relations and the degree to which teachers socially constructed their jobs on an isolated basis or as members of an organization.

Teachers in this study frequently mentioned the isolation in their work, a perception consistent with a half-century of research on the sociology of teaching. However, in our conversations with teachers, two meanings of isolation emerged, one threatening and the other benign. As the responses to survey question B1 indicated, teachers equated the benign meaning of isolation with autonomy, being left alone to work. But interviews revealed another, more threatening, image of isolation. It comes closer to anomie, lostness, and vulnerability in the face of external inquiry. Veteran teachers in particular told us that they were threatened by the prospect of attention through increased emphasis on evaluation and centralized curriculum. Increasingly, their recourse was to withdraw, to find some place to hide, either literally or psychologically. These cases of self-exile were usually associated with the district's perceived need to gain control over school sites. What appears to be resulting is a centralization of control

and authority and an increasing willingness to use the mechanisms of collective bargaining for those purposes.

Teachers felt that benign isolation was a traditional part of their work. One teacher gave this example:

> When I came here there was a firm policy of curriculum guides. I disagreed with the one for drama. Kids are not interested in learning the history of theater; they want to act. Once they get hooked on doing things, then they will be interested in the culture and history of the arts. Anyway, I disregarded the guide, and no one said anything. As long as the room was neat and quiet, I don't think that they cared.

In these situations isolation was not much of a bother; it was even a device that teachers felt the district sometimes purposely used to protect them. For example, the situation in one district was described this way:

> Isolation doesn't bother me so long as they don't interfere. The district has done some intelligent things. [For example, the district took] all the programs that came from the state about goals and objectives [the Stull Bill], and other programs like assertive discipline, did the plans carefully, and then put them in a file cabinet where no one has seen them since. They've managed to drag their feet, and as a result the teachers are protected from all that.

But perhaps teachers are not as protected as they might wish. Throughout our field visits, principals told us of direct pressures to control teaching on a district-wide basis. These pressures were transmitted partly through curriculum and partly through evaluation.

If the grievance clause is the heart of the contract for the teachers, the evaluation clause is the heart for administrators. Site principals are not naturally given to structured evaluation, and teachers gave substantial commentary about administrators who evaluated them badly and infrequently. These comments are typical of what teachers often said:

> "I haven't seen an administrator in this classroom in three years."
>
> "You just walk into the office at the end of the year and they hand it [the evaluation] to you. It doesn't mean much."
>
> "The [state-required] Stull Act is a farce."

Yet, there was a deep concern about evaluation. The teachers we talked to still deeply distrust evaluation, question its legitimacy, and feel that their union has given them no recourse against harsh evaluations.

A feeling of helplessness on the part of teachers was underscored in one interviewer's field note:

> I get a sense from the people I talked to at [school name] that they initially feel isolated as teachers, and kind of autonomous without much collegial spirit, and that collective bargaining has increased that feeling in that it didn't bring them what it was supposed to. It didn't unify them. It's not a union in the sense that they're together. And they feel that they have no redress to a number of things.
>
> They don't feel they have any recourse with the administrative staff or any recourse with their colleagues in the [union]. They think the CTA is silly because it can't even manage its own budget, and so they go into their classrooms and close the door and stay there.

One teacher told of his evaluation history in these terms: "I went for years with exemplary evaluations, till I started getting active in the Association [union], and then they went zoom" [indicating a crashing plane with his hands]. Still, he did not turn to the union for intervention. Teachers in each of the three districts told us different versions of this story. One had received a three-page letter from the principal, with whom he thought he had a "perfect relationship," chastising him for failing too many students. In many cases, teachers felt that negative evaluations were linked to the teacher's involvement in the union, that the union was helpless to assist them, and that "there are only a few more years to go to retirement."

The question of the social isolation teachers experience and its relationship to labor relations raises an interesting research hypothesis and labor policy problem. From the research standpoint, we are presented with a dimension of teaching work that the four-cell, two-dimension ideal-type did not anticipate--that is, in addition to thinking about work according to its

task definition and oversight provisions, one can think about it in terms of whether the work is executed in social isolation or in close interaction with others. We know that the four ideal types of work--labor, craft, profession, and art--are practiced quite differently in isolation than they are in groups. We also know that many other policies affect this dimension of work--physical proximity, school architecture, team teaching, and integrated curriculum, for example. But generally, labor relations has not been considered as an important policy in shaping this dimension of teaching.

To the extent that we believe that teaching in an organizational context is important, tracing the connection between labor relations and the individual's perception of work is also important.

References

Dunlop, J. T. Industrial Relations Systems. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958.

Kerchner, C. T., and Mitchell, D. E. "The Dynamics of Public School Collective Bargaining and Its Impacts on Governance, Administration and Teaching." A technical report to the National Institute of Education (ERIC document 221 925). 1981.

Kuhn, J. Bargaining in Grievance Settlement. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Levinson, H. Organizational Diagnosis. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Mitchell, D., and Kerchner, C. "Teaching Policy." In Handbook of Teaching and Policy, edited by L. Shulman and G. Sykes. New York: Longmans, 1983.

Taylor, F. W. Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper, 1911.

Whyte, W. H. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Appendix A

Case Study Questions and Document Collection

1. Identifying Information (get document or specific datum for capitalized items).

   1.1. Number and level of school sites.

   1.2. ORGANIZATION CHART.

   1.3. Community characteristics (from census data and CAP scores).

2. School Organization and Environment Information

   2.1. NAMES AND DATES OF SERVICE OF SUPERINTENDENTS FOR THE PAST 15 YEARS. Also, the circumstances of the turnovers: issues involved, whether or not turnovers were involuntary, extent of public opposition.

   2.2. School board election history for the past 15 years. BOARD MEMBERS, CHALLENGING CANDIDATES, ELECTION OUTCOMES (exact vote totals are not necessary). Apparent issues in board elections, changes in tone of the board, union support, other coalitions formed to support or oppose candidates.

   2.3. Major incidents; disturbances; interventions by state or federal education officials; COURT SUITS, INCLUDING DESEGREGATION CASES (get citation only). Apparent impact of the disturbance on the school district.

   2.4. Financial condition of the district. RANKING IN COUNTY, STATE, EXPENSES PER ADA.

   2.5. Indications of opinion about the district and studies of its operations, particularly those about curriculum, staff training, labor relations, or school climate. Ask about any dissertations, accreditation reports, or academic research done in the district.

3. Community Participation and Influence Structure

   3.1. List district-sanctioned committees, their area of concern and apparent influence.

   3.2. List nonsanctioned groups, committees, apparent political coalitions, their areas of concern and apparent influence.

4. Labor Relations Information

   4.1. BARGAINING UNITS, NAME OF ORGANIZATION, MEMBERSHIP, EXTENT OF STAFF.

4.2. For the teacher organization, the details of its history, such as staff support, internal divisions, financial status, and decertification attempts, if any.

4.3. Description of strikes or other job actions.

4.4. Number and duration of contracts for teacher organization.

4.5. Brief description of the history of negotiations, major issues, and disturbances.

4.6. Brief description of the grievance and contract administration history.

4.7. Description of the current tone of labor-management relations.

4.8. CURRENT CONTRACT.

5. Student Achievement

5.1. CAP SCORES.

5.2. Achievement trends.

6. Curriculum

6.1. Current adopted curriculum.

6.2. Specialized curriculum in place, special education, bilingual.

6.3. Process for curriculum decisions.

6.4. Processes to account for the implementation of the curriculum.

7. Staff Development

7.1. Current staff development program.

7.2. District process for needs assessment.

7.3. Inservice programs regarding collective bargaining.

7.4. Teaching characteristics: distribution according to training and years of service on the salary schedule.

8. Evaluation

8.1. CURRENT EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS OR PLANS FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. Extent to which the formal and the actual evaluations coincide.

8.2. Discipline and dismissals: current practice.

Appendix B

Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Thank you for agreeing to help. This survey concerns the effects that various aspects of labor relations have had within school organizations, particularly the effect on teachers and teaching.

Answer each question by circling the one response that best reflects your feelings about the question. Answer with your first impressions. There are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer all the questions.

This survey is intended for scientific research purposes only. The names of persons, schools, and school districts participating will be kept completely confidential.

C. T. Kerchner
Associate Professor of Education and Public Policy

1. Are you a male or a female? M ____ F ____

2. What is your race or ethnic group?

( ) Black
( ) Chicano
( ) Other Spanish Speaking
( ) Native American
( ) Oriental
( ) White
( ) Other

3. How long have you taught school?

___ This is my first year
___ 1 to 3 years
___ 4 to 7 years
___ 8 to 11 years
___ 12 to 15 years
___ more than 16 years

4. How long have you taught in this school?

___ This is my first year
___ 1 to 3 years
___ 4 to 7 years
___ 8 to 11 years
___ 12 to 15 years
___ more than 16 years

5. How much formal preparation do you have?

___ BA
___ BA + Credential
___ BA + Specialist Credential
___ MA
Other _____

6. Draw a circle around the grades that you teach now.

Preschool K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

7. In what do you specialize, if any.

( ) Bilingual
( ) Special Education
( ) Resource Specialist
( ) Speech/Language
( ) Reading or Math
( ) Subject Matter _____

8. Please give us your impression of the overall tone of labor relations in this district (choose one).

( ) Open warfare
( ) Armed truce
( ) Some trust
( ) Peaceful coexistence
( ) Active cooperation

A. Perceptions of Organizations

In this section, we are interested in your description of the teacher's organization, the administration, and the school board in this district. There are no right or wrong answers. We are simply interested in your impressions.

Please circle only one number in answering each question. If you need additional assistance, there is a Sample Question below.

SAMPLE QUESTION

****

Schools in the United States are basically well run.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Largely Disagree
3. Disagree Somewhat
4. Mixed Feelings
5. Agree Somewhat
6. Largely Agree
7. Strongly Agree

1---2---3---4---5---6---7

If you strongly agreed that the schools in the U.S. were well run, you would circle the number 7; if you felt that they were not at all well run, you would circle the number 1.

If you felt that schools were best characterized as being somewhere between these extremes, you would circle the number that bests represented your feelings. For instance, if you felt that the schools were well run in most cases, you would circle 6, to largely agree with the statement.

****

Circle one response

THE TEACHER'S ORGANIZATION . . .

A.1	is strong and well organized.	1---2---3---4---5---6---7
A.2	is successful in dealing with school management.	1---2---3---4---5---6---7
A.3	has competent leadership.	1---2---3---4---5---6---7
A.4	acts responsibly.	1---2---3---4---5---6---7
A.5	actively tries to influence school board policies.	1---2---3---4---5---6---7
A.6	supports political candidates.	1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.7 tries to influence the state legislature. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.8 tries to influence parents. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.9 is quite likely to go out on strike. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.10 is successful in increasing pay and benefits. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THIS DISTRICT . . .

A.11 is successful in running the schools. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.12 acts responsibly in dealing with teachers. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.13 emphasizes the development of innovative programs. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

THE SCHOOL BOARD IN THIS DISTRICT . . .

A.14 is well organized and efficient. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.15 is characterized by high conflict, loud debates, and split votes on important issues. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.16 makes all important policy decisions openly and with adequate input from all interested parties. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.17 is preoccupied with collective bargaining issues or problems. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.18 accepts as legitimate the rights of teachers to bargain collectively. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

A.19 is satisfied with the current relationship it has with the teachers. 1---2---3---4---5---6---7

B. Perceptions of Teaching

In this section we are interested in how you perceive the job of teaching in this school. Please circle the one number that best indicates your perception of teaching in this school. The closer you place your circle toward one description or the other, the better you think that description fits teaching at this school. Circle only one number in each line.

****

SAMPLE QUESTION

My work is varied 1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8 My work is routine

If you felt your work was quite varied, and not very routine at all, you would circle 1. If you felt the opposite, you would circle 8. If your work were a mixture of variety and routine, you would circle a number toward the middle. So, for a job that was mostly routine, but with periodic variations, you might circle 6.

****

B.1	My work is largely autonomous.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	My work is largely directed by others.
B.2	There are lots of standard practices here.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Each of us works in different situations.
B.3	My teaching is mainly being responsive to situations that arise.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	My teaching is mainly being carefully planned.
B.4	Teachers here are independent.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Teachers here are part of the organization.
B.5	Lack of cooperation by a teacher poses a severe threat to a high-quality program.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Teacher incompetence poses a severe threat to a high-quality program.
B.6	Sensitivity to students' individual differences is essential for good results.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Loyalty to carefully planned programs is essential for good results.

B.7	Poor achievement test results often indicate poor management.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Poor achievement test results often indicate too much time is being spent frivolously.
B.8	Loyalty to my school counts most.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	My individual sense of responsibility for good practice counts most.
B.9	Dedication and effort are central to good teaching.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Care and precision are central to good teaching.
B.10	Establishing a group feeling of togetherness is essential.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Enforcing high standards of teacher competence is fundamental.
B.11	Good teaching requires expertise and precision in applying proper techniques.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Good teaching requires flexibility and accuracy in the diagnosis of students' needs.
B.12	A responsible teacher must resist interference in determining appropriate classroom strategies.	1--2--3--4--5--6--7--8	Even the most creative teacher must be responsive to suggestions or critical evaluation.

C. Patterns of Interaction

In this section, we ask you to tell us about working associations in the school. Our only purpose in asking these questions is to examine patterns of working relationships. No inferences of status or popularity can or should be made. Please remember that these data will be used for statistical purposes only, and names will not be revealed to anyone.

C.1 Would you please indicate the name of the person at this school to whom you would most frequently turn for advice and support on academic matters.

_____

C.2 Would you please indicate the name of the person at this school to whom you would most frequently turn for advice and support concerning matters of faculty welfare.

_____

We would like to interview a number of persons who are answering this questionnaire so that we can obtain their opinions in more detail. The interview takes about 40 minutes and will be arranged at a time and place convenient to you. If you are willing to be interviewed, please fill in the following:

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____

Zip _____

Phone where we can contact you: ( ) _____

Best time to call _____

Appendix C

Interview Guide

Name _____

School _____

Interviewer _____

CLAREMONT GRADUATE SCHOOL
Labor Relations Research Project
Interview Guide
3/9/83

1. Is there a policy at this school regarding time for arriving/leaving? ___

   a. yes
   b. no

   1.1 If the answer is yes, how did this become a policy?

      a. collective bargaining agreement
      b. policy manual
      c. school board
      d. the administration/principal
      e. don't know

_____

_____

2. If you asked to leave school early for personal business, what would be your principal's response?

   a. would be denied
   b. would be permitted if I had a good reason
   c. would be permitted because the contract provides for it
   d. would be permitted if I had my work done
   e. would be permitted if I found someone to cover my duties

   2.1 How is policy enforced?

      a. someone comes by my classroom
      b. sign-in sheet
      c. time cards
      d. other _____
      e. there is no enforcement

_____

_____

3. Is there a policy at this school regarding duty-free breaks?

a. yes
b. no

3.1 How did this become policy?

a. collective bargaining agreement
b. policy manual
c. school board
d. the administration/principal
e. don't know

4. Are you ever asked to work during your breaks?

a. no, never
b. rarely
c. occasionally (at least once a month)
d. often (at least once a week)

4.1 If you were asked to work during your break on a preparation period, would you

a. say no
b. say yes, if it was an emergency
c. say yes, and file a grievance
d. say yes, if there was extra compensation
e. say yes, complain to ( ) boss; ( ) friends; ( ) union

4.1.1 If a or e, what would you do then?

5. Is there a policy at this school about involuntary transfers?

a. yes
b. no

5.1 Have you ever been involuntarily transferred?

a. no
b. once
c. twice
d. more than twice

6. Is there a policy at this school about after-school meetings or inservice sessions?

a. yes
b. no

6.1 If the answer is yes, how did this become a policy?

7. If you were asked to stay after school for a meeting, how would you react?

a. I'd stay because it is required by policy.
b. I'd stay if the principal hadn't called too many meetings.
c. I'd stay if there was a good reason for the meeting.
d. I'd stay if I receive extra compensation.
e. I would not stay for any reason.

8. How would you handle a situation at school you didn't agree with?

a. I'd discuss it with my fellow teachers.
b. I'd discuss it with my principal.
c. I'd discuss it with my association representative.
d. I'd threaten to file a grievance.
e. Other _____

9. How would you handle a complaint from parents?

a. I'd discuss it with my fellow teachers.
b. I'd discuss it with my principal.
c. I'd discuss it with my association representative.

10. In your school, what determines who gets supplies and material?

a. your popularity with the principal
b. you get them if it's part of your categorical program
c. if they are required by the contract
d. if the teachers association can get them for you
e. other _____